



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,145	04/13/2004	Peter J. Stromquist	M61.12-0628	4540
27366 7590 08/18/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
IWARERE, OLUSEYE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3687				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/18/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/823,145

Applicant(s)

STROMQUIST, PETER J.

Examiner

OLUSEYE IWARERE

Art Unit

3687

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2009.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 and 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the communication sent on March 4, 2009. The amendments and remarks have been fully considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. The rejections under **35 USC § 101** have been withdrawn due to proper amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1 – 5, 8 and 14 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (2004/0059651) in view of Gorelik (2001/0047372).**

As per claims 1 and 14, MaGuire discloses A method of configuring an Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL) package for loading source data elements from a financial table of a financial data store into a reporter table having pre-defined format, the method comprising:

providing a computer including a processor (fig. 3 depicts providing a processor);

providing a tangible computer-readable medium (fig. 3 depicts a tangible computer readable medium);

forming one or more association objects, each of which are instantiations of the association class and identify one or more source columns of the financial table that are associated with a destination column of the reporter table ([0021] and fig. 1 depicts forming association objects);

forming a transformation object, which is an instantiation of the transformation class and defines defining a transformation of source data elements of at least one of the source columns from a source format into a reporter format of the associated destination column identified by the association object (fig. 1 and [0022] depict forming a transformation object via the conversion engine); and

generating instructions for configuring an ETL package to extract the source data elements of the source column, transform the source data elements into the reporter format in accordance with the transformation object, and load the transformed source data elements into the associated destination columns of the reporter data table in accordance with the association objects (fig. 1 and [0022] depict generating instructions via the rules database).

However, MaGuire discloses a conversion engine and fails to explicitly disclose providing an Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL) designer module stored on the tangible computer readable medium, the ETL designer module
a destination column class defining destination column objects each identifying a destination column of the reporter table;

an association class defining association objects each identifying an association of at least one source column of the financial table with a destination column identified by a corresponding destination column object; and

a transformation class defining transformation objects each responsible for a transformation of the source data elements of the source column into a reporter format of the associated destination column as identified by a corresponding association object;

executing the ETL designer module using the processor; and
generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module.

Gorelik teaches a nested relational data model, with the features of providing an Extraction, Transformation and Loading (ETL) designer module stored on the tangible computer readable medium, the ETL designer module comprising:

a destination column class defining destination column objects each identifying a destination column of the reporter table (fig. 6 depicts defining destination);

an association class defining association objects each identifying an association of at least one source column of the financial table with a destination column identified by a corresponding destination column object (fig. 6 depicts defining association); and

a transformation class defining transformation objects each responsible for a transformation of the source data elements of the source column into a reporter format

of the associated destination column as identified by a corresponding association object (fig. 6 depicts transformation);

executing the ETL designer module using the processor (fig. 6 depicts executing an ETL designer module); and

generating instructions for configuring an ETL package, responsive to executing the ETL designer module (fig. 6 depicts instructions for configuring).

From this teaching of Gorelik, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of MaGuire to include the ETL system taught by Gorelik, in order to provide means for relation of data.

As per claims 2 and 15, MaGuire discloses, wherein the transformation includes substituting at least a portion of the source data elements with a predefined substitution element ([0036] and fig. 2C disclose substituting).

As per claims 3 and 16, MaGuire discloses, wherein the transformation includes parsing the source data elements (fig. 2C and [0033] disclose parsing the elements).

As per claims 4, 5, 8, 17 and 18, MaGuire discloses the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns, wherein the transformation includes pivoting the source data elements of the source column and including an ETL generator

method configured to programmatically communicate with an ETL services module of a server to configure an ETL package based on the destination, association, and transformation objects.

Gorelik teaches a nested relational data model wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns ([0122] discusses concatenating);

wherein the transformation includes pivoting the source data elements of the source column ([0160] discusses pivoting); and

including an ETL generator method configured to programmatically communicate with an ETL services module of a server to configure an ETL package based on the destination, association, and transformation objects ([0006] discloses an ETL system).

From this teaching of Gorelik, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of MaGuire to include the concatenating, pivoting and ETL system taught by Gorelik, in order to further provide means for relation of data.

As per claim 19, MaGuire discloses wherein forming one or more association objects includes receiving a user input defining the association of one or more source columns with a predefined destination column ([0039] discusses user definition).

As per claim 20, MaGuire discloses wherein forming a transformation object includes receiving a user input selecting the transformation ([0022] discusses selecting).

As per claim 21, MaGuire discloses including a step of validating that an association object has been completed for each destination column of the reporter table prior to generating instructions for configuring an ETL package ([0031] discusses validation and completing).

5. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MaGuire (2004/0059651) and Gorelik (2001/0047372) in view of Pape (US 20080030348 A1).

As per claims 6 and 7, MaGuire and Gorelik disclose the claimed invention but fail to explicitly disclose, wherein the transformation and association objects are each siblings of one of the destination column objects and wherein the destination column objects are siblings of a destination table object defined by a destination table class.

However, Pape teaches a method and system for agricultural data collection and management with the features of wherein the transformation and association objects are each siblings of one of the destination column objects ([0217] discusses sibling relationships to events); and

wherein the destination column objects are siblings of a destination table object defined by a destination table class ([0217] discusses sibling relationships to events).

From this teaching of Pape, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of MaGuire and Gorelik to include the above features taught by Pape, in order to provide data collection and management.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed April 6, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation is found in the title of the Gorelik reference.

As per claims 1 and 14, applicant requests the Examiner to specifically identify the elements of the cited references corresponding to the claimed ETL designer module, destination column class, destination column objects, an association class, association objects, a transformation class and transformation objects. Fig. 6A depicts a transformation engine, 114, which is understood to include the transformation class and

objects. Fig. 6, item 210 depicts declarative rules, which is understood to include the destination column class and destination column objects and fig. 6, item 210 contains the rules which is understood to include the association class and association objects.

As per claim 4, applicant argues, the concatenating transformation disclosed in Gorelik is, "unrelated to the transformation of source data elements of source columns of a financial table as required by independent claims 1 and 14.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Collins (US 20020065744 A1), which teaches a Method for internet matching of user request to specific merchandise.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUSEYE IWARERE whose telephone number is (571)270-5112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on (571)272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew S Gart/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3687